

Meeting of the Central Corridor Community Advisory Committee July 17, 2008

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Kirstin Beach (Chair), Larry Englund, Ken Erickson, Denise Fosse, Missy Gettel, Steve Grans, Brian Hanninen, Richard Hanson, Margot Imdieke Cross, David Johnson, Jackie Lunde, Rozanne Severance, Keith Thompson, Dave VanHattum, Chip Welling, Anne White,

Members Absent: Fredrick Blocton, Veronica Burt, Patricia Carlson, Bill Carter, Mohamed Egal, Readus Fletcher, Metric Giles, Doug Hennes, Maricruz Hill, Karen Inman, Xiong Pao Lee, Richard Kleinbaum, Ken Rodgers, Nick Rosenberry, Tim Schwartz, Seng Tchaa, JoAnn Tesar, Jessica Treat, , John Wicks, Chris Worthington.

Others Present:, Jim Alexander, Laura Baenen, Joey Browner, Robin Caufman, Dana Dellis, Donna Drummond, Mark Fuhrmann, Jessica Hill, Linda Jungwirth, Sarah Penman, Rita Rodriguez, Dan Soler, Carol Swenson. Oscar Gonzalez, Eve Vang, Kathryn O'Brien, Joe Scala.

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Kirstin Beach called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM. Jackie Lunde and Richard Hanson proposed edits to the June meeting minutes, which were made.

a. Chair's Report

Chair Beach noted that Art Sidner resigned because he moved out of the region; a replacement is being sought. Missy Gettel replaces Kirsten Denzer representing the Graduate Student Association. Staff is working to replace other vacancies. Chair Beach noted that the Metropolitan Council's Transportation Accessibility Advisory Committee (TAAC) submitted a letter outlining their concerns.

b. CAC Members' Reports

Rozanne Severance read the TAAC's letter that outlined concerns about station design, public art and accessibility.

c. Community Outreach Reports

Eve Vang introduced herself and her role as the new Associate Outreach Coordinator for the Central Corridor Project Office. She has been talking to businesses along with Shoua Lee and highlighted a conversation they had with Bobby Lee, owner of Paj Tawg, a fabric and housewares store, about the loss of on street parking. Ms. Vang said he is encouraging other businesses to complete the survey.

Jessica Hill gave an update on her work with businesses. She said that she has been going business to business to talk to them about the project. She's received surveys representing 70% of the businesses on University Avenue in Minneapolis. In this part of the corridor, there are very few impacts due to the loss of on street parking because most businesses say they have access to ramp or adequate surface lots. She also noted that two businesses in her area were featured on WCCO TV because they are anticipating redevelopment.

Anne White asked if the loss of property at Overflow Coffee has been mitigated. Mark Fuhrmann indicated that we will have to take some property for the station and that process is underway.

2. PROJECT UPDATE

FTA Guidelines

Mark Fuhrmann started the project update with an update on the new FTA guidelines that were released last week. The FTA raised the CEI threshold for a medium rating by \$0.50 to \$24.49, which equates to a 2.1% increase. However, the guidelines also required projects to inflate their cost estimates by 3.5% increase which puts the project CEI at \$24.83 or \$0.33 over the threshold.

Denise Fosse asked what cost efficiencies we are looking to make? Mr. Fuhrmann said that we are looking at all aspects of the project as well as construction efficiencies to reduce costs. Ms. Fosse noted that Hiawatha was completed 28 days ahead of schedule and asked if that saved? No.

Anne White asked what that \$0.32 CEI equates to in project costs? Mark indicated we are still looking into the cost implications; depending on where cuts are made it will be in the \$5-15 million.

Larry Englund asked if the September documentation to the FTA would include station design. Mr. Fuhrmann said that station design is only 20% complete, compared to the rest of the line which is 30%. FTA does not expect us to have the public art level of detail available for the September 5 submission. Station design will be completed in Advanced Preliminary and Final Design; about a year from now.

On Street Parking

Mr. Fuhrmann provided an update on the parking issues.

Dave VanHattum asked if the survey will tell us about utilization? The survey will tell us about the nature of the business as well as employee needs.

Chip Welling asked if parking utilization will also include observations of parking usage? We are looking to the businesses to tell us about the nature of their businesses and needs.

Anne White asked for clarification about how many businesses there are on University Avenue? There are 2500 businesses estimated in the corridor and 1300 on University Avenue. The 300 surveys received to date equates to about 1/3 return rate.

Municipal Consent

Mark Fuhrmann reviewed the outcome of the municipal consent process which was unanimous approval from all four jurisdictions. Chair Beach noted that each of these jurisdictions approved the preliminary plans approved the plans even though there are outstanding issues such as on-street parking and station design. Mark Fuhrmann said that we are continuing to work with the project partners and having an ongoing dialogue about these issues. Chair Beach congratulated the CCPO on a collaborative effort.

Anne White suggested that it would be useful to make the resolutions available to the CAC members. Mr. Fuhrmann said that we provide copies of the certified resolutions when they are available.

Memorandum of Understanding with the University of Minnesota

Mark Fuhrmann provided an overview of the Memorandum of Understanding with the University of Minnesota that was approved by the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, UofM and Met Council. He highlighted the three types of mitigations needed to address traffic concerns both existing and as a result of the project.

Missy Gettel asked why prioritization was chosen over pre-emption? Traffic impacts would be significant with pre-emption; prioritization would minimize impacts and maintain traffic flow.

Ms. Gettel also asked about impacts to loading docks and magnetic equipment on campus. We have completed studies and are looking at mitigation of sensitive equipment and found that there is only one facility that is going to require mitigation. We have estimated and allocated \$1 million for mitigation of these lab facilities.

Chip Welling asked how LRT vibrations compare to background vibration by trucks, cars; what is the level of magnitude? Due to the urban nature of the project there is already a lot of noise and vibrations due to existing traffic. We have conducted studies at 4 p.m. to calibrate our model.

Larry Englund asked about impacts to the historic churches on Cedar Street and whether we conducted studies on Sunday to determine level of impact during services. Kathryn O'Brien noted that we set up noise monitors for a 24 hour period during the weekday, not on the weekend, to capture the worse case scenario.

Ken Erickson asked if the testing included McNally Smith. It did not.

Mr. Fuhrmann concluded his report by reviewing the three levels of responsibilities:

- Metro Transit will control design of the Central Corridor LRT project
- Hennepin County or City of Minneapolis will control roadway designs
- UofM will donate necessary property

Anne White asked if the Washington Avenue bridge design and construction would be included in the second Memorandum of Understanding. Very likely.

3. Technical Reports

Traffic Study #5

Dan Soler presented the finding of Traffic Study #5 which looked at traffic impacts if University Avenue was modified to include only one lane of through traffic in each direction. Current plans include 4 lanes of traffic; two in each direction. The purpose of Study #5 was to determine the impacts of roadway and intersection operation if reduced to one through lane in each direction from Eustis to Rice Street on University Avenue.

Missy Gettel asked who completed the study? Central Corridor Project Office staff and traffic consultants.

Mr. Soler presented the findings of the report. Currently, Lexington Avenue is the only failing intersection. If reduced to one lane in each direction, 13 intersections fail as well as backup on cross streets.

Study also allows us to look at travel time and speed. One-lane traffic in each direction would result in average traffic speed of 5 miles per hour. At this speed, one could assume that it would change people's travel patterns. Assuming 10% of the traffic is diverted off University Avenue, we would still expect to see nine failing intersections.

Dave VanHattum asked about the level of service for 2014. We are modeling travel demand with and without LRT, which will give us traffic flow volumes that we can then use in traffic and level of service analysis. We are anticipating slight percentage increase in traffic by 2014; in the single digits.

Richard Hanson asked if people will be looking for alternative routes during construction, assuming that lanes of traffic will be closed for a period of time. With construction project, there are short term impacts. However, experience has shown that the duration is short enough that they return to the businesses and former traffic patterns.

Ken Erickson commented that now is the time to educate the community on alternative routes such as Pierce Butler.

Anne White noted that the study was conducted for evening rush hour peak traffic and asked if we would look at having the second lane for parking during the day but open to traffic for evening rush hour. That question gets to how the road is going to function, which is more of a city decision. The traffic on University Avenue has a small peak in the morning and then builds around the noon hour, drops off slightly but then builds again for evening rush hour. We would need to look at traffic periods and see if there are times that would allow it to be used for parking during not peak volume times.

Jackie Lunde asked if we could do a left turn lane instead of a right turn lane. All modeling includes left turn lanes.

Carol Swenson asked about the length of turn lanes that were used in the modeling? As they are today.

Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Kathryn O'Brien introduced herself as the project manager for the environmental analysis. She indicated that we have prepared and published the SDEIS that analyzes the nine scope changes since the DEIS was prepared in 2006. She noted that we've used various media and methods to let people know that the SDEIS is available. We will also be holding 3 public hearings, which is above the federal requirements of one. The document is available for public review online and at public libraries.

Ms. O'Brien reviewed the SDEIS content and what it is; it is a document that reviews environmental impacts of project changes including:

- Connection to Hiawatha LRT
- East Bank alignment changes
- 3 future stations at Hamline, Victoria and Western
- Capitol area alignment changes
- Downtown St. Paul stations
- Traction power substations
- Expansion to 3 car platforms to accommodate future demand
- Vehicle maintenance facility in downtown St. Paul
- Washington Ave. bridge

Anne White asked if those items addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement would provide for public review and comment period. The statutes do not require a public hearing for the FEIS.

However, there will be opportunities for public comments and input via CAC, BAC, public meetings and other forums. Ms. White noted that the District Councils Collaborative prepared a matrix that highlights issues by neighborhood to help District Councils in their review of the document. Chair Beach asked that the DCC share a copy with the project office; Ms. White agreed.

Larry Englund recalled that last time Kathryn O'Brien was before the CAC we talked about environmental justice issues and asked how they can provide input on those issues for the FEIS. The CAC and other public meetings.

Missy Gettel suggested that the CAC could have a monthly update on the FEIS progress and mitigation strategies.

Anne White asked what the timing would be for responding to formal comments. The FEIS will document responses to comments on the SDEIS and DEIS.

4. NEXT MEETING

Chair Beach reminded the CAC that we are holding a special meeting of the CAC to introduce the 10 artist finalists. The next regular CAC meeting is scheduled for August 21, 2008 at 5:00 PM.

Anne White asked about the process for selecting an artist to work with a specific station. That will be provided in more detail on July 31.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Co-Chair Beach asked that CAC members turn in their comments sheets and adjourned the meeting at 6:50 PM.

Prepared by Robin Caufman, Manager of Public Involvement

Attachment 1: Future Meeting Topics

Responses to the following question: Identify the topics you are most interested in learning more about and presentation ideas for future CAC meetings.

- Flexibility in locating/adding stations (13) Reported analysis on 12/20/2007 CAC agenda.
- Reason for U tunnel (10) Presented tunnel and at grade route at 11/15/2007 CAC meetings.
- Job Opportunities (8) Noted need for 75 part time bus drivers and 26 mechanics due to transit demand following the collapse of the I-35 Bridge, 8/16/07 CAC. Forwarded CAC DBE press release 12/17/07. Handed out new DBE brochure and notified CAC that DBE links added to website, 3/20/08.
- Issues of cost and under-lying assumptions (6) – Presented overview of project budget at 6/21/07 CAC meeting. Analysis and costs of additional stations on 12/20/2007 agenda.
- Connecting Bus Service (6) – Presented at 6/21/07 CAC meeting.
- Construction mitigation (6) Karri Plowman shared work of BAC at 10/18/2007 CAC.
- Future expansion (cut short now or extends system in future) (5). Presented potential routes to connect to Union Depot 11/15/2007 CAC
- Access to businesses and community services during construction (4) 1/17/08 CAC talked about University Ave. reconstruction.
- Environmental Justice Analysis (4) Initiated conversation 8/16/07 CAC; submitted summary memo at 9/20/07 CAC.
- Parking, including Hide and Ride (4) Discussed at 3/20/08 CAC meeting
- St. Paul's Development Plan (4) Presented at 5/17/07 CAC meeting.
- EIS Presentation (3) Presented at 7/19/07 CAC meeting. Presented review of SDEIS on 11/15/07. Noted SDEIS timeline at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Station information including design (3) Presented Dale, Lexington, Snelling, Fairview, Raymond and Westgate station at 9/20/07 CAC. Station standard design and Capitol stations planned for 10/15/07 CAC. Discussed West Bank at 11/15/2007 CAC.
- Timelines with deadlines for decisions (3) Presented issues matrix at 9/20/07 CAC. Noted SDEIS timeline and municipal consent dates at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Community Benefits Agreement (2)
- Gentrification (2)
- Historic sites along the line/route (2) - Pointed out historic buildings on 4/19/07 CAC tour.
- Residential development and safety (2) Outreach staff reported at 3/20/08 CAC meeting that they received safety certification and will be putting together a safety program.
- Signal pre-emption or prioritization for LRT (2) 1/17/08 CAC presented initial traffic signalization and street crossing plans. Talked about signalization at 3/20/08 CAC.
- Summary Report on RFP process (procedure) (2)
- Access to line (1) Discussed pedestrian access at 1/17/08 and 3/20/08 CAC meetings.
- Bike Lane (1)
- Techniques to reach all constituencies (1) Brainstormed stakeholders and public involvement strategies at 2/15/07 CAC.
- Union Depot (1). Presented potential to connect to Union Depot 11/15/2007 CAC.
- Very detailed information must be provided (1)
- Visual simulations of corridor design (1) – Include at beginning of CAC meetings. Showed visualization of 5 block segment of corridor with potential design elements at 3/20/08 CAC meeting.
- Working groups and clear outputs/products (1). Started using workstation format at 10/18/2007 CAC.
- Balance budget outcome with outcome of meeting people
- Best way to Reach ELL
- Communication Plan – Presented to the CAC on 3/15/07.
- Discussion around overlapping service “sheds” for downtown stations vs. lack on parts of University (How was station placement determined)/equitable access.
- Financing (other options)
- Streetscaping - 1/17/08 CAC talked about University Ave. reconstruction. 6/19/08 introduced streetscape elements

Attachment 2: Responses

1. Now That the CAC has had an opportunity to provide input on the 37 scope issues. Identify two topics that you are most interested in learning more about and agenda ideas for future CAC meetings.

- The idea of building and maintaining a 4 lane University avenue but driving non-peak times allowing on-street parking is a great compromise, for local businesses impacted by the loss of parking. Please Pursue!
- More consideration of 4 lanes only during PM peak two lanes rest of the day?
- Agenda Item: Reports from cities and counties engineering staff and planning staff with regards to road and other infrastructure changes that may result from but may not be directly related to the Central Corridor LRT project.
- I still think we need to discuss the economic impact of this particular transit model on certain communities, particularly the old Rondo and Frogtown areas without additional stops. I fear we are creaking further disparities in our communities by not introducing some elements of a “Community Development” model with transit as a component of sound and smart development. We need to discuss and have more information about potential environmental regards as well as data surrounding vibration and noise. For instance, how will these effect infants, children and elders? Is there any long term research from other states available? CCCAC needs to know about proposed mitigation on a regular basis. This should be discussed at meetings to ensure communication to constituents.
- University Avenue design parking. U of M role memorandum; what are sources for non-project funds for betterment? Mitigation, buses through U of M corridor, SDEIS updates.
- Concerning memorandum of understanding, specifically betterments, these are funded by non-project resources. Could we have a list of these sources? The buses running from Minneapolis to STP campuses at U of M as well as campus circulator from West Bank to East Bank along University important to students because of areas covered. A fair free zone could not completely replace them.
- University Avenue design parking. U of M role memorandum. SDEIS general environmental
- North and South road extensions and additional bus service. Bike accommodations along the corridor and on the train.
- Report back as timely on how FDEIS will respond to 9 Key Issues identified in SDEIS>
- More on how we create art for stations. Need to educate pedestrians, especially at Snelling and University.
- We need to be able to see what issues are being addressed though mitigation. Updates on different issues each meeting?

Attachment 3: CAC meeting July 17, 2008 – Meeting Feedback

To be completed

1. Results

Results tallied from feedback forms distributed toward end of meeting. Form asked members to grade overall meeting performance and today's meeting format on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 was the lowest and 5 the highest. Grades are replicated in columns to the right.	Overall Meeting Performance	Today's Meeting Format
	4	4
	4	4
	5	5
	1	3
	5	4
	4	5
	2	2
	4	4
	3	3
Average	3.6	3.8